REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12 and 20 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 12 and 20 are sought to be amended. Claims 13 and 15 remain canceled. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 12, 14 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,682 (hereinafter referred to as "Peterson"). Claims 6-11 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson. Regarding claims 7 and 9, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to store and stream television programs in compressed form, and to decompress said programs prior to viewing, for the purpose of minimizing required storage space and transmission bandwidth. Regarding claims 10, 11, 18 and 19, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to replace or update an application program in a computing device for the purpose of

upgrading older software to a newer, improved version. Regarding claims 6 and 8, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to encrypt both streaming and stored media content in order to limit access to said content to authorized viewers, and likewise it is well known in the art for content receivers to include decryption means to decrypt encrypted media content when appropriate, for the purpose of permitting authorized users to enjoy encrypted content. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 1-12, 14 and 16-24 since Peterson and the Official Notices, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 12 and 20 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 12 and 20 have been amended to include a similar feature of wherein the first content manager registers with a coordinator by informing the coordinator of the first digital data type and wherein the second content manager registers with the coordinator by informing the coordinator of the second digital data type. Peterson and the Official Notices, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 12 and 20 (and their dependent claims 2-11, 14, 16-19 and 21-24) are patentable over Peterson and the Official Notices, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Appln. Serial No. 09/823,400 Reply to Nonfinal Office Action mailed on January 9, 2006

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311

if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been

properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and

complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes

that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and

allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: 4/10/06

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126

Molly A. McCall

(703) 633-3311

P10860 RCE Reply to Nonfinal OA

12